REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. The Examiner rejected Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 12-15, and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 5,590,038 to Pitroda. The Examiner rejected Claims 3-4 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of Pitroda and United States Patent No. 6,615,190 to Slater. The Examiner rejected Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of Pitroda and United States Patent No. 5,740,364 to Drerup. Applicants herein amend Claims 1-9, 11-13, and 15-20.

Amendments Unrelated to the Examiner's Rejections

Applicants believe that original Claims 2-9, 11-13, and 16-20 would be allowable without amendment. Nevertheless, Applicants have amended Claims 2-9, 11-13, and 16-20 in order to make the claims more readable and to broaden the claims. Applicants respectfully submit that the amended limitations of Claims 2-9, 11-13, and 16-20 are at least as broad as or broader than the original limitations. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added to amended Claims 2-9, 11-13, and 16-20.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 15 to respond to the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to Claims 1 and 15 overcome this rejection, and respectfully ask the Examiner to withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 12-15, and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Pitroda. Pitroda teaches a universal electronic transaction card that stores information about multiple credit card accounts. The card includes a display that displays a "visibly perceptible replica of a credit card and a visibly perceptible replica of the user's signature." The card, which can be used for payment, transmits credit card account data to a point-of-sale device. Additionally, the card can receive data, such as electronic receipts, from the point-of-sale device.

By contrast, the claimed method of Claim 1 allows a portable information agent to be moved from an initial application to a location outside of the initial application while preserving the state of the portable information agent. Specifically, Claim 1 specifies that the portable

information agent is initially "a part of a first composition" that provides "a first execution context for said portable information agent." Upon relocation, the portable information agent "becomes part of a second composition, said second composition providing a second execution context for said portable information agent in which said state of said portable information agent is preserved."

Accordingly, Pitroda, which teaches the transmission of mere data from one hardware device to another, does not teach the relocation of a "portable information agent" from within an initial application to a location outside of the initial application while preserving the state of the portable information agent, as specified by the method of Claim 1. Furthermore, Pitroda does not teach relocation of a portable information agent in a way in which the portable information agent is initially "part of a first composition" but then "becomes part of a second composition" as specified by the method of Claim 1.

Similarly, Pitroda does not teach at least the limitation of Claim 15 that requires "allowing a user to select said portable information agent object and relocate said portable information agent object outside of said initial application." Furthermore, Pitroda does not teach the limitation "moving said portable information agent object to said new location such that said portable information agent object becomes part of a second composition that provides a second execution context for said portable information agent object." Indeed, rather than teaching the relocation of a "portable information agent object" from a "first execution context" to a "second execution context," Pitroda merely teaches transmitting financial data from one hardware device to another.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Pitroda does not teach or suggest either Claim 1 or Claim 15. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Pitroda does not teach or suggest the claims that depend upon Claims 1 and 15. Specifically, with regard to Claim 2, Pitroda does not teach "the method according to claim 1 wherein said portable information agent, once relocated, persists and maintains said state after termination of said initial application."

With regard to Claim 5, Pitroda does not teach "the method according to claim 1 wherein said initial application comprises a desktop provided by an operating system."

With regard to Claim 6, Pitroda does not teach "the method according to claim 1 wherein said relocation is repeatable from a current location to any number of additional platforms."

With regard to Claim 7, Pitroda does not teach "the method according to claim 5 wherein said desktop provided by an operating system comprises an interface of a platform, said platform selected from the group consisting of: a Windows PC, a Macintosh PC, a unix-type operating system, a set-top box, a wireless logic appliance, an internet appliance, a personal digital assistant, or another device connected to a network."

With regard to Claim 8, Pitroda does not teach "the method according to claim 1 wherein said new location is selected from the group consisting of: a desktop provided by an operating system, a different application, and a different computer platform with a different operating system."

With regard to Claim 9, Pitroda does not teach "the method according to claim 1 wherein said portable information agent includes one or more user interface components and wherein said interface components are preserved after a relocation."

With regard to Claim 10, Pitroda does not teach "the method according to claim 1 wherein said portable information agent includes one or more connections to one or more external entities and wherein said connections are preserved after a relocation."

With regard to Claim 17, Pitroda does not teach "the method according to claim 15 wherein said new location is selected from the group consisting of: a desktop provided by an operating system, a different application, and a different computer platform with a different operating system."

With regard to Claim 18, Pitroda does not teach "the method according to claim 15 wherein said portable information agent is associated with a graphic object constructed from presentation primitives that allow user interaction with said graphic object."

With regard to Claim 19, Pitroda does not teach "the method according to claim 15 wherein said portable information agent object includes logic allowing communication with a data server for tracking user interaction."

With regard to Claim 20, Pitroda does not teach "the method according to claim 19 wherein said portable information agent object and said infrastructure allow communication with a data server for tracking user interaction after said portable information agent object has been moved to a new location."

Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added by the foregoing amendments. For example, paragraphs 0032-0035 and Figs. 8 and 9 of the specification as filed

disclose the claimed hierarchical composition architecture, in which a portable information agent is part of a composition of other such portable information agents. In Fig. 8, a portable information agent, or Envoii 120c is shown as part of a composition, in which the portable information agent 120c is the child of another portable information agent 110, which is in turn the child of another portable information agent 100. According to paragraph 0032, the portable information agent 100 is a "MetaVoii" that "is an executable component that is generally transparent to an end-user and that allows Envoiis PIAs to operate." Accordingly, the illustrated composition of portable information agents provides an execution context for a portable information agent. For ease of understanding, it is noted that throughout the specification, a PIA, an Envoii, a MetaVoii are all sub-classes of "portable information agents."

In order to aid the Examiner's understanding of compositions of portable information agents, Applicants have summarized certain characteristics of the composition of a portable information agent that is illustrated by Figs. 8 and 9. As would be understood by a skilled artisan in light of the specification, the illustrated composition of Figs. 8 and 9 is an illustrative composition only, and the methods of Claims 1-20 are not limited to being performed on compositions with the structure illustrated by Figs. 8 and 9.

Believing that Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 12-15, and 17-20 are patentable over Pitroda, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 12-15, and 17-20.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 In View of Pitroda and Slater

The Examiner rejected Claims 3, 4, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious in view of Pitroda and Slater. To support an obviousness rejection, the Examiner must show, in addition to a motivation to combine references, that a combination of references has every limitation of the claim at issue. Applicants respectfully submit that a combination of Pitroda and Slater does not have every limitation of Claims 3, 4, and 16.

With regard to Claims 3 and 4, these claims incorporate the limitations of Claim 1. Applicants have shown that Pitroda does not teach "presenting a graphical representation of a portable information agent as part of a first composition accessed by an initial application, said portable information agent comprising a software object, having state, and having one or more possible external connections, said first composition providing a first execution context for said portable information agent." Furthermore, Applicants have shown that Pitroda does not teach "moving said portable information agent to said outside location such that said portable

information agent becomes part of a second composition, said second composition providing a second execution context for said portable information agent in which said state of said portable information agent is preserved" Moreover, the Examiner does not assert that Slater teaches these limitations, and Applicants have found no such teaching in Slater. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that a combination of Pitroda and Slater does not render Claims 3 and 4 obvious because such a combination does not have every limitation of Claims 3 and 4.

Claim 16 incorporates the limitations of Claim 15. Applicants have shown that Pitroda does not teach "providing a portable information agent object as part of a first composition accessed by an initial application, said portable information agent object comprising a software object, said first composition providing a first execution context for said portable information agent object." Furthermore, Applicants have shown that Pitroda does not teach "moving said portable information agent object to said new location such that said portable information agent object becomes part of a second composition that provides a second execution context for said portable information agent object." Moreover, the Examiner does not assert that Slater teaches these limitations, and Applicants have found no such teaching in Slater. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that a combination of Pitroda and Slater does not render Claim 16 obvious because such a combination does not have every limitation of Claim 16.

Believing that Claims 3, 4, and 15 are patentable over Pitroda and Slater, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of Claims 3, 4, and 16.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 In View of Pitroda and Drerup

The Examiner rejected Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious in view of Pitroda and Drerup. To support an obviousness rejection, the Examiner must show, in addition to a motivation to combine references, that a combination of references has every limitation of the claim at issue. Applicants respectfully submit that a combination of Pitroda and Dreup does not have every limitation of Claim 11.

Claim 11 incorporates the limitations of Claim 1. Applicants have shown that Pitroda does not teach "presenting a graphical representation of a portable information agent as part of a first composition accessed by an initial application, said portable information agent comprising a software object, having state, and having one or more possible external connections, said first composition providing a first execution context for said portable information agent." Furthermore, Applicants have shown that Pitroda does not teach "moving said portable

information agent to said outside location such that said portable information agent becomes part of a second composition, said second composition providing a second execution context for said portable information agent in which said state of said portable information agent is preserved" Moreover, the Examiner does not assert that Drerup teaches these limitations, and Applicants have found no such teaching in Drerup. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that a combination of Pitroda and Drerup does not render Claim 11 obvious because such a combination does not have every limitation of Claim 11.

Believing that Claim 11 is patentable over Pitroda and Drerup, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of Claim 11.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested. If further issues remain to be resolved, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned such that any remaining issues may be promptly resolved.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 11/05/2004   By: _Ted M Cannon_

Ted M. Cannon
Registration No. 55,036
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(949) 760-0404

AMEND
H:\DOCS\TMC\TMC-2313.DOC
102504

-11-